

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re application of: Hacena et al.

Application No.: 10/785,602

Filed: 24 February 2004

Title: WIRELESS COMMUNICATION NETWORK FOR PROCESSING CALL TRAFFIC
OVER A BACKHAUL NETWORK

Group No.: 2683

Examiner: Michael Vu

TELEPHONE INTERVIEW SUMMARY

*Applicant submits this telephone interview summary to meet the requirements of 37
C.F.R. § 1.133(b), and according to the requirements listed in MPEP § 713.04.*

Date/Type of Interview: telephone interview conducted on 21 September 2006

Examiner: Michael Vu

Name of Applicant's attorney: M. Gratton

Exhibits shown or demonstrations conducted: None

Claims discussed: 1 and 7

Prior art discussed: Williams (US Patent Publication 2003/0158954)

General thrust of Examiner's arguments: see below

General thrust of Applicant's arguments: see below

Agreement reached and general nature of the agreement: see below

Proposed amendments: see below

Other pertinent matters:

Applicant's undersigned attorney and the Examiner discussed various aspects of the system in the rejected claims. Applicant's undersigned explained the system of the present application and the differences between the present claims and the Williams and Smith references.

Specifically, Applicant's undersigned attorney explained that Williams does not disclose centralized call processing functionalities as recited by the claims (e.g., call processing system in an MSC). Rather, Williams discloses a de-centralized wireless communication system lacking an MSC and traditional call processing functions (e.g., a switched telephone network). Further, Applicant's undersigned attorney explained that there would be no reason to combine Williams and Smith to add the MSC from Smith to the translator system of Williams, as Williams is a de-centralized system that would not need a centralized switching system (e.g., an MSC).

The Examiner suggested Applicants amend elements of claim 7 into claim 1 to further clarify that the system is a wireless communication network having a centralized switching system (e.g., an MSC), rather than a decentralized communication comprising walkie-talkies and similar devices.

Date: 2 November 2006



SIGNATURE OF PRACTITIONER

Max Gratton, Reg. No. 56,541
Attorney for Applicant and Assignee
Duft Bornsen & Fishman, LLP
Telephone: (303) 786-7687
Facsimile: (303) 786-7691